www.historymarg.com
History Research Journal

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

Historiography of National Movement: A Case of 'Indian India'

Dr. Maitree Vaidya Sabnis

Associate Professor
Department of History
Faculty of Arts
The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda
Vadodara 390002
email: maitreesabnismsu@gmail.com
M-91-9879534257

Abstract: Modern Indian historians has focused most of its attention on writing history of British India and discourses on the princely states or 'Indian India' was left to the margins. The Princely states which consisted of at least half of population and region in the pre-independent times did not experience the strength of national movement. There were two contradictory responses from the states. On the one hand the rulers were believed to be in cahoots with the colonial government and on the other people of some of the princely states went against their own rulers and supported the Indian national movement. This paper highlights various writings on the idea of nationalism in the princely states and its binary responses.

Keywords: 1) Gujarat; 2) Indian Historiography; 3) National Movement; 4) People's Movement; 5) Princely states

The history of 'Indian India' or princely states has been in the shadows of the traditional historical writing, whereby the focus was on British India or British provinces. The Princely India covered more than 1/3rd of the land and 1/4th of the population. Despite that in Indian historical writings, these states largely remained neglected and overshadowed by developments in the British provinces. Whatever little attention was paid to them remained restricted to the ruling elites i.e. the Rajas and the Nawabs. The descriptions remained restricted to them acting as puppets of their imperial masters. However in the past few decades more attention began to be paid to understand the other half of Indian region. Here also attention was paid to two specific areas such as the end of the empire and the role of the princely states in it and the integration of princely states in the Union of India. The attempt made in this paper is to trace the Historiographical developments in the historical writings on various aspects of princely states. The special focus or emphasis is laid on national movement in the princely states. The princely states are often viewed as being two-dimensional. One facet focuses on the dynamics of collusion with the colonial rulers. Another facet pivots around the people's movement or more popularly the "prajamandal movements". The attempt indeed has been made to pay attention to historical writings on both these dimensions. The

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

paper in fact traces the writings of scholars chronologically and in the process to explore the nucleus of patterns of the various writings.

Out of the various schools of thoughts of modern Indian historiography, it was the Imperialist school, which paid the foremost attention on the princely states. However, as was the tradition with the Imperialist school, the histories were written by British officers in the late nineteenth century. Their perception and understanding of Indian history was largely governed by the need of the colonial state to establish their supremacy, at times to make their rule legitimate. However, there were very few scholarly works which did not focus beyond the relationship of the colonial government with these states. Primary work was "The Protected Princes of India" by Lee Warner.[1] Besides these there were many reports which narrated the events and incidences occurring within the states. However, one barely comes across as any historical work, which critically looked at the responses of these rulers to underlined presence of paramountcy. There were individual narratives of certain rulers like the Maharaja of Baroda or the Nizam of Hyderabad, by English officers, who either travelled with them or were in some capacity in close contact with the rulers.[2] The twentieth century can be called as the beginning of the era of nationalistic historiography, which itself was not free of problems. The princely states, as the abetted allies of the colonial power, did not receive much attention of the nationalist historians. The rulers on their own account did try to understand their shifting equations with the British as the national movement assumed an aggressive momentum in 1930s.[3] However still the historical debate was not engaged with and it was only in the post-independent India, that majority of work on the different dimension and aspect of Princely

[1] Clumes, John, *An Historical Sketch of the Princes of India*, 1833; Lee-Warner, William, *The Protected Princes of India*, Vol. 7, Macmillan and Company, 1894; Chudgar, Popatlal L., and Josiah C. Wedgwood. *Indian princes under British protection: a Study of their personal rule, their Constitutional Position and their Future*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1929; MacMunn, George Fletcher, *The Indian States and Princes*, Jarrolds, Limited, 1936; Das, Taraknath, *Sovereign Rights of the Indian Princes*, Ganesh & Co., 1924; Forbers, Rosita. *India of the Princes*" ,1939; Sullivan, John. *Are we bound by our Treaties? A Plea for the Princes of India*, 1853 ; Thompson, Edward. *The making of the Indian princes*" 1943; Tod, James, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, Or, the Central and Western Rajpoot States of India*. Vol. 1. G. Routledge & Sons, 1914.

[2] Elliot, F. A. H.. *The Rulers of Baroda*, Baroda: Baroda State Press, 1879; Sergeant, Philip Walsingham, *The Ruler of Baroda: An Account of the Life and Work of the Maharaja Gaekwar*. London: J. Murray, 1928; Mc Auliffe, Robert Paton, *The Nizam: The Origin and Future of the Hyderabad State*, Cambridge, 1904; Mateer, Samuel, *Native life in Travancore*. WH Allen & Company, 1883; Stanley Rice, *Life of Sayaji Rao III, Maharaja of Baroda,* London: Oxford University Press, 1931, E. L. Tottenham, *Highnesses of Hindostan,* London: Grayson and Grayson, 1934; Edwardes, S. J., and L. G. Fraser. *"Ruling Princes of India, Junagadh*." 1907.

[3] Panikkar, Kavalam Madhava. *The Indian Princes in Council: A Record of the Chancellorship of His Highness, the Maharaja of Patiala*, 1926-1931 and 1933-1936. Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1936; Sinh, Maharaj-Kuamr Raghubir. *Indian States and the New Regime*. Read Books, 1938; Pyarelal Nair. *Status of Indian Princes*. Hesperides Press, 1941*; Maharaja of Bikaner, Minutes on Certain Points Relating to the Indian States and their Rulers,* 1915; Singh, Gurmukh Nihal. *Indian States & British India: Their Future Relations*. Nand Kishore & Bros., 1930; Gauba, Khalid Latif. HH: or, *The Pathology of Princes*. Times Publishing Company, 1930

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

India was carried out. The need was more to understand the shifting paradigms of integration of the princely states with the Union of India.

Number of works focused on the aspect of Integration of India. The primary focus was, of course, on the role of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel in completing this arduous task without many glitches.[4] However, a need was also felt to understand the perspective of the princely states in foregoing their traditional rights. For instance, work was carried out on political integration of Gujarat vis-à-vis the princely legacies from the British.[5] An attempt was made to understand the integration of the princely state of Hyderabad and the establishment of a new Hyderabad.[6] In 1981, a monograph was published which focused on major South Indian princely states and their process to be integrated into the Indian Union.[7] A very pertinent question was raised by John R. Wood which was that it was hazardous to talk about the patterns of political integration in the 22 states of contemporary India. His article "British versus Princely Legacies and the Political Integration of Gujarat" was written in the year 1984, when the historical writings on the experience of princely states with Nationalist discourse, wherein he argues that it was difficult to generalise about the post independence experience of 550 separate princely states.[8]

The decades after independence showed the rise of newer historiographical trends. The field of social history and economic history was on rise and hence more and more attention was paid to the study of socio-economic aspects of Indian history. Modern Indian histories hence received the close attention of the historians. Within that paradigm number of studies were carried out which looked at the Princely states from politico-socio-economic perspectives. Works like History of Freedom Struggle in the Princely States by Rajendra Handa in the year 1968, which was a preliminary study

[4] Phadnis, Urmila. *Towards the Integration of Indian states, 1919-1947*, Asia Publishing House, 1968; Krishnaswami, Arcot. *The Indian union and the States: a study of autonomy and integration*. New York, Pergamon Press, 1965; Copland, Ian. "Lord Mountbatten and the integration of the Indian states: A reappraisal." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 21, no. 2 1993: 385-408; and the land marking work Menon, Vapal Pangunni. "*The Story of the Integration of the Indian States*." 1956

[5] Wood, John R. "British versus princely legacies and the political integration of Gujarat." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 44, no. 01 1984: 65-99.

[6] Sherman, Taylor C. "The integration of the princely state of Hyderabad and the making of the postcolonial state in India, 1948–56." *Indian Economic & Social History Review* 44, no. 4 (2007): 489-516; Benichou, Lucien D. *From autocracy to integration: political developments in Hyderabad State, 1938-1948*. Orient Blackswan, 2000

[7] Rangaswami, Vanaja. *The story of integration: a new interpretation in the context of the democratic movements in the princely states of Mysore, Travancore, and Cochin, 1900-1947*. Manohar, 1981; Sharma, Phool Kumar. "Integration of princely states and the reorganization of states in India." *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 28, no. 4 1967: 236-241; Krishnaswami, Arcot. *The Indian union and the States: a study of autonomy and integration*. New York, Pergamon Press, 1965.

[8] Wood, John R. "British versus princely legacies and the political integration of Gujarat." The Journal of Asian Studies 44, no. 01, 1984: 65-99.

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

less critical more basic, nonetheless very important.[9] Another important work of the time was written by Barbara Ramusack, titled as "The Princes of India in the Twilight of Empire: Dissolution of a Patron-Client System, 1914-1939". This study seeks to fill the gap by focusing on "those rulers who became active in all-Indian politics during the period between 1914 and 1939 ... to discover what options were open to them when the balance of power was changing in an imperial system. Professor Ramusack indicates that during World War I, at a time of British need, the client princes assisted their hard-pressed imperial patrons by providing men and money for the war effort. This timely support created a credit balance on the princes' account which was rewarded after the war with the establishment of the Chamber of Princes, a body which was intended to protect princely interests under the revised constitution. Although the rising tides of nationalism necessitated their greater involvement in British Indian affairs, the princes were not able to emerge as effective political figures. Their options were limited because the government was not willing to let them "forge any alliances with British Indian groups that might threaten British power… [or] to bring the princes into the decision-making processes existing below that level. Consequently, its application of the patron-client concept acts primarily as a description of a relationship rather than as a building block and framework for understanding paramountcy and its effects on the wider society and polity. This study comes across as the first systematic survey of relations between the British and the princely states in the twentieth century. [10]

Another well credited book was published in the same year, which covered different aspects of the princely states in historical discourse. The title of the book was as "People's Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Polity in the Indian Princely states", edited by Robin Jeffrey and was published by Oxford University Press. [11] The essays collected in this volume covered various aspects of the politics of the Indian princely states in the nineteenth and twentieth century. These studies were carried out with the 1970s and were concerned with the affairs of British India which had so far dominated the field of South Asian Studies. The issues that were raised were questions of bureaucratic modernisation in the late nineteenth century. In the context of Alwar, a critique was offered which said that the replacement of patrimonial regimes by modern administrative flowed from some mysterious quality of superiority. The modernisation in the princely states was the result of pressures from the colonial authority. This led to serious social and political dislocation. Karen Leonard another contributor, focused on Hyderabad, and showed how the communal identities were

[9] Handa, Rajendra Lal. *History of Freedom Struggle in Princely States*. Central News Agency, 1968.
[10] Ramusack, Barbara N. *The princes of India in the twilight of Empire: Dissolution of a Patron-Client System, 1914-1939*. Ohio State University Press, 1978
[11] Jeffrey, Robin, ed. *People, Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Politics in the Princely States*, Oxford University Press, 1978.

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

formed leading to conflict. Barbara Ramusack contributed an essay which illuminated the passage from precolonial, to colonial and to post colonial society. In doing so, she discussed the relationship between princely and religious authority and politics in and around the princely Punjab. She found the dynamics of religions undermining the superficial separation of princely India from British India long before the independence was formally proclaimed at independence. John Wood investigated nationalism in the princely context through the medium of the Rajkot Satyagraha of 1938-39. Many ambiguities and complexities of the relationship between the Gandhian Congress and the princely states were highlighted through the medium of the Rajkot Satyagraha of 1938-39. The state of Travancore was discussed by Robin Jeffrey. Rajat Ray discussed that the national movement had its vibrancy even in the most "backward" of the areas. Both these studies gave comprehensive perceptions with relation to princely states which so far had been missing. Simultaneously, another work focused on the princely states of Rajasthan. It mainly concerned with the agrarian systems in the major princely states in Rajasthan. The book was written by Hira Singh and was titled as "Colonial Hegemony and Popular Resistance".[12]The central theme of the book is the idea that the dynamics of colonial "social formations" can best be understood through attention to resistance and struggle. The "reaction from below" and "reaction from above"were presented in a finely meshed analysis which did not readily fit into any of the established intellectual paradigms.

In the next two decades came few important works on the involvement of the princely states in the National Movement. Sovereignty, Power, Control: Politics in the States of Western India, 1916-1947 by John Macleod.[13] Instead of giving a bird view of the princely states, this work focused specifically on Western India. Here, he established a connect between the princes of Western India, the nationalist politicians and the British Raj This book pictures the patterns of interaction between these three agents. Macleod defined the interests of these three parties and was able to show how tier relationship is shaped by "sovereignty" by the rulers, "power" by the politicians, and "control" by the British. Essential topics such as the princes' right to collect duty on imported goods, the debate over the tiny states in the Gujarat, the British policy towards youthful princes, and the honours system are carefully explored. This thorough study offers the opportunity to gain a clear understanding of "the mechanics of political interaction in princely India". The focus was on the responses of the rulers to pressure exerted from the Raj, and how on more than one occasion it led to nationalist leanings of the ruler. Bharati Ray's book focuses on British paramountcy, the development of imperial policy toward India's princely states, and its implementation in Hyderabad

[12] Singh, Hira. *Colonial Hegemony and Popular Resistance: Princes, Peasants, and Paramount Power*. Sage Publications Pvt. Ltd, 1998.
[13] McLeod, John. *Sovereignty, Power, Control: Politics in the States of Western India, 1916-1947*. Vol. 15. Brill, 1999.

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

state in the nineteenth century. A portion of her book focuses on the response of the Dewan Salar Jung analysis to say that the paramountcy although secured the position for the Nizam, yet it did nothing much for the benefit of the people.[14]

A historical discourse on communalism, an important offshoot of Indian National Movement had been paid due attention by the scholars. However, paradigmatic shift occurred when communalist tendencies and processes were studied in the princely states. Ian Copland for instance, in 1988 discussed the case of Hyderabad in his article, "Communalism in the Princely India: The Case of Hyderabad, 1930-40.[15] The very next year, he published another article titled as, "The Princely States, the Muslim League and the Partition of India" in 1991.[16] In this article his focus was to understand why is that the Congress was able to persuade the princely state to be joined with Indian Union and where is it that Muslim League failed in their persuasion and conviction. He concluded that majority of the princely states had Hindu population and therefore the need to woo their (in case of any) Muslim rulers, did not yield results. Dick Kooiman, who later edited an important anthology, published an article in 1995 which attempted at communalism in Indian Princely States. The Indian princely states that were the subject of his study were Baroda and Travancore. Here, he used the principal of separate electorates introduced by the colonial government to showcase that the principal cause behind establishment of separate electorates was the introduction of separate electorates. However, through his thesis he is able to prove that rather the demand for separate electorates may have been an effect rather than a cause of communalism.[17] In the year 2002, Dick Kooiman, came out with a book, entitled as "Communalism and Indian Princely States: Travancore, Baroda & Hyderabad in 1930s".[18]This work explores the contentious issues of communitarian politics in the 1930's in the princely states. The author however fails to emphasise the importance of selecting the period 1930s. Perhaps, this could be because parallelley the national movement in India was getting its communal hues. Kooiman focuses on three princely states, Travancore, Baroda and Hyderabad. Travancore was a Hindu dominated state with a large Christian minority. Baroda had an intermixture of both Hindu and Muslim population. Hyderabad was a Hindu majority state with a Muslim ruler. As can be seen, there were different parameters which were at work here. The

[14] Ray, Bharati. *Hyderabad and British Paramountcy, 1858-1883*. Oxford University Press, USA, 1988.
[15] Copland, Ian. "'Communalism' in Princely India: The Case of Hyderabad, 1930–1940." *Modern Asian Studies* 22, No. 04 (1988): 783-814.
[16] Copland, Ian. "The Princely States, the Muslim League, and the Partition of India in 1947." *The International History Review* 13, no. 1 (1991): 38-69.
[17] Kooiman, Dick. "Communalism and Indian Princely States: A Comparison with British India."*Economic and Political Weekly* (1995): 2123-2133.
[18] Kooiman, Dick. "Communalism and Indian Princely States: Travancore, Baroda and Hyderabad in the 1930s." (2002).

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

book focuses on the interface between the colonial ideologies and its response in the princely state Kooiman deals with the economic status which reflects that all the three states focused on economic development and growth whether being an export-oriented economy or business depending on indigenous trade. He also discusses the ramifications of constitutional developments in British India on the three selected princely states. Baroda and the state of Travancore adopted legislative councils with both elected and appointed members. Hyderabad rejected the constitutional developments in favour of continuing with monarchy. So far as the concept of communalism goes, it is interlaced with capitalist and democratic changes creating regional conclusions and a competitive environment in which rivalries for power and position resulted in oppositional group identities. Although neither of the states crated separate electorates still the social apparatus was tension ridden (in case of Travancore) and needed negotiations with the dominant group (in case of Baroda). Hyderabad was an exception to both the scenarios. There emerged a divisive atmosphere. According to Kooiman, it was due to the British policies and the national movement. This came to fore when the ruler being a Muslim had the desire to follow and seek support of Hindu revivalist Arya Samaj and the polemical Hindu Mahasabha. This created a sordid communal divide.

Ian Copland again paid attention to the evolution of communalist tendencies in the princely North India. This book was published in 2005 and was titled as, "State, Community and Neighbourhood in Princely North India, c. 1900- 1950".[19] It focused on the rise of inter religious (Hindu-Muslim and Sikh-Muslim) violence and "communal politics" in the northern tier of the princely states. It seeks to answer two questions, namely, how to explain the comparative freedom of the princely states from both these phenomena in comparison with British India before the 1930s, and their manifestation after the 1930s in a small number of the northern states. Copland's principal answer to the second question is that those states that fell prey to communal politics and bloody riots after the 1930s and most especially during the partition rioting of 1946-47 were subjected to the same economic and political changes that engulfed the adjacent northern provinces of Uttar Pradesh and Punjab. Moreover, in the most important finding of his work (here and in previously published articles), consistent also with the work of Shail Mayaram, he argues that, after having been bastions of religious coexistence, these princely states not only joined in the mayhem and massacres of 1946-47, but they were 'absolutely central to the killing'. They provided funds, arms, and safe havens to the killing squads that roamed their states, and the rest of East Punjab, and engaged in deliberate ethnic cleansing of the Muslims from these areas.

[19] Copland, Ian. State, Community and Neighbourhood in Princely North India c. 1900-1950. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

Manu Bhagavan, a budding scholar at that point of time, in the next few years wrote series of scholarly works [20] focusing on varying aspects of the involvement of princely states in the nationalist discourse. His scholarly works critically looked at the problems that the princely states faced while offering a challenge to the colonial rule. He, by and large discussed the princely state of Baroda, while arguing his case. Bhagavan continued to explore the grounds for more evidence to understand the dynamics of operation within the princely states, which would offer a justification of their presences or absences in the nationalist discourse. As a result, he is credited with writing various articles questioning the set notion of the development in the Princely states. He has used the lens of more progressive states of the pre-independence times to showcase how they mimicked modernity from their colonial counterparts and how they (i.e. the rulers) couldn't carry out on the same. In "Demystifying the Ideal Progressive', he argues that It was Sayaji Rao's (Gaekwad) linking of his actions with the discourse of modernity and, thereby, with an anti-colonial agenda, that really distinguished the enterprises of his State. It was Baroda's constant references to 'the modern' that revealed a nuanced understanding of the nature of colonialism and the nature of resistance."[21]The area of communal politics also has been dealt by few other scholars.

The major issue that was raised by Bhagavan was how higher educational institutions were ingeniously used as a tool to extend their colonial control. In 2002, in an article of his, 'The Rebel Academy: Modernity and the Movement for a University in Princely Baroda, 1908-1949'Bhagavan argued that the movement for a university in Baroda represented strategic continuity of Baroda's resistance policies. The institution of universities was central to the "civilizing mission of colonialism, of turning backward society into a modern nation. The British therefore presented the university to the Indian public as an engine of progress a tool that would eventually obviate the need for colonialism itself. However, the control that they exercised on the establishment of higher educational institutions made setting up of a university, nothing less than a challenge. However, the princely state of Baroda defied British power both directly by challenging the institutional authority of Bombay University under whose jurisdiction Baroda fell, and indirectly reconstituted modernity in a way that not overtly undermined its use in colonial ideologies. In the year 2003, Manu Bhagavan, published his book called as "Sovereign Spheres: Princes, Education and Empire in Colonial India. It was published by the Oxford University Press. In his book, "Sovereign Sphere", detailed on the attempts made by ambivalent nature of the paramountcy system was able to shape

[20] Bhagavan, Manu Belur. Higher Education and the" modern State": Negotiating Colonialism and Nationalism in Princely Mysore and Baroda. unpublished thesis 1999; Bhagavan, Manu. "Demystifying the 'Ideal Progressive': Resistance through Mimicked Modernity in Princely Baroda, 1900-1913." Modern Asian Studies 35, no. 02, 2001: 385-409;
[21] Bhagavan Manu (2001), 408-409

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

themselves into sits of resistance to British imperial rule. He paid attention to two states, Baroda and Mysore vis-a-vis their attempt to achieve their aim of establishing universities. The state of Mysore achieved that aim in five years whereas Baroda took forty. His basic argument is that the princely state during the colonial era represented 'negotiated spaces for power', a 'pivotal sphere', as in freedom to achieve its goals within the nucleus of the family. They had freedom to construct their own imageries about progress and modernity which boldly challenged the imperial. Although, the anti-colonial resistance of these two states were not quiet western but were subtle. They borrowed from the British structure and drew plaudits from Indian nationalists. The two states were hailed as living proof that the Indians were fit for home rule. Bhagavan focused on a fresh dimension on the administrative meddling by the Indian government. The significant forms of colonial control come to fore when the time came for the establishment of new universities. The model in India adhered to collegiate model of the University of London, which vested governing function to such as setting of curricula and examining in the University, but left the actual teaching of the undergraduate to affiliated colleges. When colleges were established in the states, they too were forced to affiliate with one of the half dozen established metropolitan universities. This Bhagavan represents led to significant form of colonial control. However, this very control led to a conflict between the princely states of Mysore and Baroda with the imperial authority. Bhagavan also in his book treated the two rulers with respect and even calls them "uncanny statesman", who was not afraid to champion the cause of Indian nationalism. This issue was again raised in the 2006, by Margret Frenz and Georg Berkemer through an article, 'Colleges and Kings: Higher Education under Direct and Indirect Rule'.[22]Here the princely state of Travancore and the Northern Sircars are used as the case studies. They concluded that education, whether under the regional rulers or foreign depended on their will. They say, "…these modernities were not mutually exclusive". The argument that they gave was that they were based on common forms of reasoning and they needed the other as a counterpart.[23]

One of the important works published in 2004 titled as, "People's Movement in the Princely states", focused in specific on the response of the people to the national movement. This work was edited by Yallampali Vaikuntam[24] and was in fact a collection of articles as paper presented at a seminar organized by the Indian Council of Historical Research in 1994. Here the focus was on various movements in the princely states. They were not necessarily related to ongoing national movement

22 Frenz, Margret, and Georg Berkemer. "Colleges and Kings: Higher Education under Direct and Indirect Rule." Economic and Political Weekly (2006): 1261-1268.
23 Frenz, Margret, and Georg Berkemer (2006), 1276
24 Vaikuntham, Yallampalli. *People's Movements in the Princely States*, Manohar Publishers, 2004

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

but were a simultaneous part of the time. They were protest and resistance movements by peasants but also campaigns by freedom fighters, the struggle responsible for government and the awakening of women's consciousness. It is in essence the history of the people. The articles focused on specific regions, for instance there are five articles on Hyderabad state, two on Mysore and one which focused on both of them. Two articles were published on Kashmir and Travancore. One research article each on Gwalior, Orissa and Banganapalle was published. The essays see the experience of the princely states as part of a much wider whole and relate it to general developments in Indian history-the rise of the modern state, the impact of colonialism, the growth of nationalism, etc. A significant theme that emerges from these discussions is the attitude of the Congress towards the princes. Here the tenderness shown in many Congress quarters to socially conservative and autocratic regimes raises questions about the democratic and progressive values often seen to lie behind the nationalist movement. Most of the articles shed light on the varied relationships between the colonial power and the princely states and give insights into the hegemonic strategies of colonialism. Indrani Sen shows how the colonial fiction composed during 1858-1900 reproduced an ideology ("imagined" reality) that represented the Indian princes as the "Other," as the "spent force," and in moral and political decline, thus legitimizing and making indispensable British rule in India. This legitimacy was worked out and negotiated variously, and often, as Biswamoy Pati argues, the princes themselves indirectly served to legitimize colonialism and imperial history, for example, by participating in the popular cults and modernizing processes, Hinduizing the tribal population, reinforcing the existing class/caste and gender hierarchies, and constructing their royal genealogies. This anthology raise important questions for future research: What kind of autonomy did the princely states "really" enjoy during the British Raj? Were the economic and political systems and regional autonomy that these princely states developed in the aftermath of Mughal decline fully retained as the British negotiated various treaties with these states? Was the British policy of "noninterference" after the Rebellion of 1857, as Ernst and Pati argue, the "hegemonic shift" in British policy? How far were the princes able to exercise their power in the real sense, given that the colonial power still "retained the right to intervene in states and to remove rulers from power when necessary". As the British also made various types of treaties and military engagements with the princely states, and applied different policies such as "subsidiary alliance" and the "doctrine of lapse" in order to constrain the Indian rulers' freedom of action in the economic and political fronts, it is important to pay close attention to these questions when addressing the issue of "autonomy" of princely states. While the articles are devoted to the

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0976-5425
Vol-5-Issue-5-September-October-2019

specific issues and times, they also open the way for similar types of studies of the many princely states and time periods not covered in this anthology.[25]

The Subaltern school in specific paid more attention to not traditional fields.[26]New tools and lens were used to explore the unknown. Interesting writings came forth which used Indian cinema, medicine, dramatic trails to explain the realm of subaltern in the princely states.[27]Not all the work was carried out by historians but also by anthropologists as well.

The nationalist discourse raised many issues as can be gleaned from afore mentioned account. However, there are many issues that still require serious attention of the historians. There is number of accounts in the regional languages, which focus on especially on people's movements called the Prajamandal in their specific regions.[28] However, unfortunately these studies do not have wider reach and hence they remain outside the realm of historiography. The field of regional histories covers various dimensions, however the historiographical discourse on princely states is lacking. Although, since the beginning of the second millennium, more and more attention is being paid to the princely states there is still much work to be done and many field to be explored.

[25] Ernst, Waltraud, and Biswamoy Pati, eds. India's Princely States: People, Princes and Colonialism. Routledge, 2007.Harvard

[26] Cleetus, Burton. "Subaltern medicine and social mobility: the experience of the Ezhava in Kerala." *Indian Anthropologist* (2007): 147-172; Singh, Hira. "Popular protest in princely states and India's post-colonial unity: Colonial mode of historiography and subaltern studies." In *Fifth international conference on alternative futures and popular protest*, vol. 2. 1999; Singh, Hira. "Caste, class and peasant agency in subaltern studies discourse: revisionist historiography, elite ideology." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 30, no. 1, 2002: 91-134; Cockell, John G. "Ethnic nationalism and subaltern political process: exploring autonomous democratic action in Kashmir." *Nations and Nationalism* 6, no. 3, 2000: 319-345.

[27] Chakraborty, Chandrima. "Subaltern Studies, Bollywood and" Lagaan"."*Economic and Political Weekly* 2003: 1879-1884; Cleetus, B. 2007. Subaltern medicine and social mobility: the experience of the Ezhava in Kerala. *Indian Anthropologist*, 147-172; Jhala, A. D. 2009. The Malabar Hill murder trial of 1925 Sovereignty, law and sexual politics in colonial princely India. *Indian Economic & Social History Review*, *46*(3), 373-400.

[28] Walia, Ramesh. *Praja Mandal Movement in East Punjab States*. Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, 1972; Mathur, V. D. "Prajamandal Movement in Rajasthan." 1989; Mathur, K. C. *Struggle For Responsible Government In Jaipur State, 1931-1949 AD*. Books Treasure, 2004; Jani, S. V. "The Limbadi'hi Jar At'-A Novel Experiment In the People's Struggle of Saurashtra." *Regional roots of Indian nationalism: Gujarat, Maharashtra, and Rajasthan* 1990: 233.

Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors